

Terms of Reference (ToR) for Individual Consultant

PROJECT TITLE	Formulation and Advancement of the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) Process in Bangladesh
POST TITLE:	National Evaluator
POST LEVEL:	National Consultant (1 Position)
AGENCY/PROJECT NAME:	Department of Environment (DoE), NAP Project
COUNTRY OF ASSIGNMENT	Dhaka, Bangladesh
DURATION OF THE CONTRACT:	Total 22 working days from 25 May 2022 to 31 July 2022 over a period of two months on intermittent basis.

A. BACKGROUND:

The project document for the UNDP-supported GCF-financed project “Formulation and Advancement of the National Adaptation Plan Process in Bangladesh” was signed on 12 February 2018 by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Government of Bangladesh. However, the project Inception Meeting kicked off in March 2020 and is currently in its last year of implementation.

The project has suffered additional delay due to COVID-19. Bangladesh recorded its first COVID-19 patient on 08 March 2020. Two weeks later, the Ministry of Health declared a public health emergency. In order to protect its population, the government declared the first "lockdown" throughout the nation from 23 March and prepared some necessary steps to spread awareness to keep this syndrome away from them, which continued until October 2020 by phases. However, the infection started to alarmingly rise once again since March 2021, the government again declared countrywide lockdown for 3 more months. Thus far, the country has recorded as of 15th November 2021, 1,572,735 confirmed cases of which 27,926 deaths. As of 8 November 2021, a total of 81,077,977 vaccine doses have been administered.

The project is being implemented by UNDP in partnership with the Ministry of Environment, Forest, and Climate Change (MoEFCC) of Bangladesh. The objective of this project is to formulate the Bangladesh National Adaptation Plan with a focus on long term adaptation investment and enhancing national capacity for integration of climate change adaptation in planning, budgeting, and financial tracking processes. This GCF NAP readiness support project planned to achieve this objective through four inter-related outcomes:

- Outcome 1: Strengthened institutional coordination and climate change information and knowledge management for medium- to long-term planning
- Outcome 2: Adaptation options appraised and prioritized, and National Adaptation Plan formulated

Outcome 3: Climate risk informed decision-making tools developed and piloted by planning and budget departments at national and sectoral levels

Outcome 4: Nationally appropriate participatory adaptation investments tracking mechanism and financial plan for mid- and long-term CCA implementation set up

The Ministry of Environment and Forests, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Planning and key personnel working on Climate Change Adaptation relevant programming in water resources, agriculture and food security, coastal zones, and urban habitation (the “priority sectors”) are the beneficiaries of this project.

B. OBJECTIVE:

UNDP commissions programme evaluations to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of its contributions to development results at the country level as articulated in UNDP’s Country Programme Document (CPD). These are evaluations carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy. In line with the Evaluation Plan of UNDP Bangladesh, project evaluation is planned to be commissioned at during the last year of the project implementation.

The UNDP Office in Bangladesh is commissioning this independent evaluation on the NAP project to capture evaluative evidence of its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and incorporation of gender and other cross-cutting issues to assess the achievement of projects results against what was expected to be achieved. The evaluation will ascertain how beneficiaries have benefited from the project interventions and what lessons could be learned that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The evaluation serves an important accountability function, providing national stakeholders and partners in Bangladesh with an impartial assessment of the results of NAP’s intervention.

C. SCOPE OF WORK:

The evaluation will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project results framework. The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines¹.

The evaluation will consider the pertinent outcomes and outputs as stated in the project document focused towards advancing medium to long term planning in climate sensitive sectors in relations to Country Programme Outcome #3: Inclusive Growth-UNDP will support the Government to meet its obligations under the Paris Agreement by strengthening policy and legislative capacities, building partnerships for climate action, particularly with the private sector, and mobilizing national and global finance. Mainstreaming environmental considerations into national policy and planning to ensure climate justice for women and marginalized groups will remain a priority.

As described in the background, the NAP programme has implemented 4 outcomes. An analysis of achievements across all 4 outcomes is expected:

¹ UNDP Evaluation Guidelines: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guidance.shtml#handbook>

NAP PROGRAMME OUTCOME 1	Strengthened institutional coordination and climate change information and knowledge management for medium- to long-term planning;
NAP PROGRAMME OUTCOME 2	Adaptation options appraised and prioritized, and National Adaptation Plan formulated;
NAP PROGRAMME OUTCOME 3	Climate risk informed decision-making tools developed and piloted by planning and budget departments at national and sectoral levels;
NAP PROGRAMME OUTCOME 4	Nationally appropriate participatory adaptation investments tracking mechanism and financial plan for mid- and long-term CCA implementation set up

The following reports and deliverables are required for the evaluation:

- TE Inception report
- Draft Evaluation Report
- Presentation at the validation workshop with key stakeholders, (partners and beneficiaries)
- Final Evaluation report

One week after contract signing, the evaluation team will produce an **inception report** clarifying the objectives, methodology and timing of the evaluation. The inception report must include an evaluation matrix presenting the evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, analysis tools and methods to be used. Annex 3 provides a simple matrix template. The inception report should detail the specific timing for evaluation activities and deliverables and propose specific site visits and stakeholders to be interviewed. Protocols for different stakeholders should be developed. The inception report will be discussed and agreed with the UNDP Country Office before the national evaluator proceed with site visits.

The **draft evaluation report** will be shared by the evaluation team to the UNDP Country Office, who will circulate the draft to stakeholders. The evaluation team will present the draft report in a validation workshop that the UNDP country office will organise. Feedback received from these sessions should be considered when preparing the final report. The evaluators will produce an ‘audit trail’ (Annex Z) indicating whether and how each comment received was addressed in revisions to the **final report**.

The suggested table of contents of the evaluation report is found in the ANNEX.

3. Evaluation Questions

The evaluation seeks to answer the following questions, focused around the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability:

Relevance:

- How well has the programme aligned with government and agency priorities?
- To what extent has NAP’s selected method of delivery been appropriate to the development context?
- Has NAP programme been influential in influencing national policies on climate change adaptation?

- To what extent was the theory of change presented in the outcome model a relevant and appropriate vision on which to base the initiatives?
- To what extent was the project in line with the UNDP Strategic Plan, CPD, United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework
- (UNSDCF), SDGs, and GCF strategic programming

Effectiveness

- What evidence is there that the programme has contributed towards an improvement in national government capacity, including institutional strengthening?
- Has the NAP programme been effective in helping improve climate change adaptation planning in Bangladesh?
- To what extent have outcomes been achieved or has progress been made towards their achievement.
- What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations to the outcome, and how effective have the programme partnerships been in contributing to achieving the outcome?
 - What were the positive or negative, intended or unintended, changes brought about by NAP's work?
 - What contributing factors and impediments enhance or impede NAP performance?
 - To what extent did the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women, and/or a human-rights based approach?

Efficiency

- Are NAP's approaches, resources, models, conceptual framework relevant to achieve the planned outcomes?
- To what extent were quality outputs delivered on time?
- Has there been an economical use of financial and human resources and strategic allocation of resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.)?
- Did the monitoring and evaluation systems that NAP has in place help to ensure that activities and outputs were managed efficiently and effectively?
- Were alternative approaches considered in designing the programme?

Sustainability

- What is the likelihood that the NAP programme interventions are sustainable?
- What mechanisms have been set in place by NAP to support the government of Bangladesh to sustain improvements made through these interventions?
- To what extent has a sustainability strategy, including capacity development of key national stakeholders, been developed or implemented?
- To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support?
- What indications are there that the outcomes will be sustained, e.g., through requisite capacities (systems, structures, staff, etc.)?
- What opportunities for financial sustainability exist?
- How has the project developed appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) that will be self-sufficient after the project closure date?

Impact

- What has happened as a result of the programme or project?
- What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?
- How many people(w/m) have been affected?
- Were there contributions to changes in policy/legal/regulatory frameworks, including observed changes in capacities (awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, monitoring systems, etc.) and governance architecture, including access to and use of information (laws, administrative bodies, trust building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc.)?
- Were there contributions to changes in socio-economic status (income, health, well-being, etc.)?
- Discuss any unintended impacts of the project (both positive and negative) and assess their overall scope and implications.
- Identify barriers and risks that may prevent further progress towards long term impact;
- Assess any real change in gender equality, e.g. access to and control of resources, decision- making power, division of labor, etc.

The evaluation must also include an assessment of the extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration:

Human rights

- To what extent have poor, indigenous and tribal peoples, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from NAP's interventions?

Gender Equality

- To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the NAP programme?
- To what extent has NAP programme promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects?
- How did the programme promote gender equality, human rights and human development in the delivery of outputs?

The evaluation team will include a summary of the main findings of the evaluation report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.

A section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the evaluation findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GCF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.

Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to

make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.

The evaluation report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GCF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the evaluation team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.

It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to include results related to gender equality and empowerment of women.

4. Methodology

The evaluation report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The evaluation will be carried out by an external team of independent evaluators and will follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with a wide array of stakeholders and beneficiaries, including national and local government officials and staff, donors, beneficiaries from the interventions, and community members.

Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of NAP's interventions must be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, evaluations and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, surveys and site visits. In the event where field mission is not possible due to COVID, then remote interviews may be conducted through telephone or online (teams, zoom etc). Under such situation, site visits will be carried out by the National Consultants. These formalities will be agreed upon during contract discussions and finalized in the inception meeting. The specific design and methodology for the evaluation should emerge from consultations between the evaluation team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the evaluation purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The evaluation team must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the evaluation report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, site visits and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the evaluation Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the evaluation team.

The final report must describe the full evaluation approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

The following steps in data collection are anticipated:

5.1 Desk Review

A desk review should be carried out of the key strategies and documents underpinning the project's scope of work. This includes reviewing the project document, different reports, country programme document, as well as any monitoring and other documents, to be provided by the project and Commissioning Unit.

5.2 Field Data Collection

Following the desk review, the national evaluator will build on the documented evidence through an agreed set of field and interview methodologies, including:

- Interviews with key partners and stakeholders
- Field visits to project sites and partner institutions
- Survey questionnaires where appropriate
- Participatory observation, focus groups, and rapid appraisal techniques

6. Evaluation Ethics

The evaluation must be carried out in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’ and sign the Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations. In particular, evaluators must be free and clear of perceived conflicts of interest. To this end, interested consultants will not be considered if they were directly and substantively involved, as an employee or consultant, in the formulation of UNDP strategies and programming relating to the outcomes and programmes under review. The code of conduct and an agreement form to be signed by each consultant are included in Annex 4.

D. EXPECTED DELIVERABLES AND OUTPUTS:

The evaluation is expected to take 22 working days for national consultant over a period of six weeks starting from 25 May 2022. The final draft evaluation report is due the 31 July 2022. The following table provides an indicative breakout for outputs and deliverables:

Deliverables/Outputs	Estimated Duration (days)	Target Due Dates (indicative)	Review and Approvals Required	% of Payment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inception report and evaluation matrix Outputs: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Review materials and develop work plan ii. Participate in an Inception Meeting with UNDP Bangladesh country office iii. Draft inception report 	4	One week after signing the contract	Programme Specialist	20%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Draft evaluation report Stakeholder workshop presentation Outputs: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Review Documents and stakeholder consultations ii. Interview stakeholders 	13	Within third weeks after signing the contract	Programme Specialist	40%

Deliverables/Outputs	Estimated Duration (days)	Target Due Dates (indicative)	Review and Approvals Required	% of Payment
iii. Conduct field visits iv. Analyze data v. Develop draft evaluation and lessons report to Country Office				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Final evaluation report Outputs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Present draft Evaluation Report and lessons at Validation Workshop ii. Finalize and submit evaluation and lessons learned report incorporating additions and comments provided by stakeholders 	5	Within eighth week after signing the contract	Programme Specialist	40%
Total	22			100%

E. TIMEFRAME

The consultancy work for a total of 22 days over a period of 2 months.

F. SUPERVISION AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

The National Evaluation Consultant will closely work with Programme Specialist (Nature, Climate & Energy) of UNDP, National Project Director (NPD) and Deputy Project Director of NAP. His/her performance evaluation will be conducted by the supervisor. The Consultant will ensure a result-based system is in place to tap key results that contribute towards the achievement of project outputs and outcomes.

G. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The UNDP CO will select the evaluation team through standard UNDP procurement processes and will be responsible for the management of the evaluators. The Head of Unit/Deputy Resident Representative Programme (DRR/P) will designate a focal point for the evaluation that will work with the M&E Specialist and Programme Manager to assist in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, arranging visits/interviews with key informants, etc.). The CO Management will take responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report. The M&E Specialist or designate will arrange introductory meetings within the CO and the DRR/P or her designate will establish initial contacts with partners and project staff. The consultants will take responsibility for setting up meetings and conducting the evaluation, subject to advanced approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report.

The CO management will develop a management response to the evaluation within two weeks of report finalization.

The Task Manager of the Project will convene an Advisory Panel comprising of technical experts to enhance the quality of the evaluation. This Panel will review the inception report and the draft evaluation report to provide detail comments related to the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis and reporting. The Panel will also advise on the conformity of evaluation processes to the UNEG standards. The evaluation team is required to address all comments of the Panel completely and comprehensively. The Evaluation Team Leader will provide a detail rationale to the advisory panel for any comment that remain unaddressed.

The evaluation will use a system of ratings standardising assessments proposed by the evaluators in the inception report. The evaluation acknowledges that rating cannot be a standalone assessment, and it will not be feasible to entirely quantify judgements. Performance rating will be carried out for the four evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

While the Country Office will provide some logistical support during the evaluation, for instance assisting in setting interviews with senior government officials, it will be the responsibility of the evaluators to logistically and financially arrange their travel to and from relevant project sites and to arrange most interviews. Planned travels and associated costs will be included in the Inception Report and agreed with the Country Office.

H. INPUTS

The Consultant will use his/her own personal laptop. The project office will provide the office space for the consultant.

I. TRAVEL AND DSA:

No DSA will be paid at the duty station. If unforeseen travel or mission outside the duty station required by the Terms of Reference is requested by UNDP, and upon prior agreement/approval, such travel shall be UNDP's expenses and the individual contractor shall receive a per-diem as per United Nations daily subsistence allowance rate.

J. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND REQUIRED COMPETENCIES:

The evaluation will be undertaken by a team of 2 external evaluators, a Team Lead (international consultant) and an Associate Evaluator (national consultant). The national consultant (Evaluator) will support the entire evaluation process and ensure to produce the final product. The national consultant will work under the guidance of International consultant. In addition to his/her direct reporting line to the international consultant, the National Consultant will rely on the project staff, partners and stakeholders to prepare the ground for effective and efficient implementation of the evaluation.

The evaluators cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document) and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

K. REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

a) ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS:

- i. Master's degree in the social/environmental sciences/ natural resource management/natural & climate science;

b) EXPERIENCE:

- i. Bangladeshi citizen or person with extensive experience working in Bangladesh during the last 5 years;
- ii. Minimum 5 years' experience carrying out development evaluations for government and civil society;
- iii. Experience working in or closely with UN agencies, any GCF funded especially UNDP, is preferred;
- iv. A deep-rooted understanding of the development context in Bangladesh and preferably an understanding of climate change/natural resource management issues within the Bangladesh context;

c) COMPETENCIES:

- Strong interpersonal skills, communication and strategic negotiation skills, ability to work in a team;
- Excellent English drafting, presentation and facilitation skills;
- Excellent oral and written English and Bangla communication skills, and exceptional technical writing and presentation capabilities;
- Plans, prioritizes, and delivers tasks on time;
- Ability to meet deadlines and work under pressure;
- Ability to work independently and participate in team-based environment;
- Innovativeness and effectiveness capability under varying work assignments, conditions and time pressures;
- Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards

L. FINANCIAL PROPOSALS

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e., whether payments fall in installments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e., upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, per diems, and number of anticipated working days).

M. EVALUATION

Individual Consultant will be evaluated based on the following methodologies:

Cumulative analysis

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should be made to the individual Consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

* Technical Criteria weight; 70%

* Financial Criteria weight; 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49% point in technical criteria would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
Technical	70%	70
Master's degree in the social/environmental sciences/ natural resource management/natural & climate science	10%	10
Minimum 5 years' experience carrying out development evaluations for government and civil society;	25%	25
Experience working in or closely with UN agencies, any GCF funded especially UNDP	25%	25
<i>Proven working experience with UN/Donors/GoB/GCF/ etc.</i>	10%	10
Financial	30%	30

Financial Evaluation: (Total obtainable score – 30)

All technically qualified proposals will be scored out 30 based on the formula provided below. The maximum points (30) will be assigned to the lowest financial proposal. All other proposals receive points according to the following formula:

$$p = y (\mu/z)$$

Where:

p = points for the financial proposal being evaluated

y = maximum number of points for the financial proposal

μ = price of the lowest priced proposal

z = price of the proposal being evaluated

(N) Recommended Presentation of Offer

Interested individuals must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications.

- a) Duly accomplished **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP;
- b) **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.
<http://www.bd.undp.org/content/bangladesh/en/home/operations/jobs/>
- c) **Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment and a methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment.
- d) **Financial Proposal**: Financial Proposal has to be submitted through a standard interest and availability template which can be downloaded from the link below:

<http://www.bd.undp.org/content/dam/bangladesh/docs/Jobs/Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal-Template%20for%20Confirmation.docx>

Please combine all your documents into one (1) single PDF document as the system only allows to upload maximum one document.

O. ANNEXES

ToR Annex 1: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team

ToR Annex 2: Content of the TE report

ToR Annex 3: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

ToR Annex 4: Ethical Code of Conduct for Evaluators

ToR Annex 5: TE Rating Scales

ToR Annex 6: TE Report Clearance Form

ToR Annex 7: TE Audit Trail

ToR Annex 1: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team

#	Item (electronic versions preferred if available)
1	Project Identification Form (PIF)
2	UNDP Initiation Plan
3	Final NAP Project Document with all annexes
4	CEO Endorsement Request
5	UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
6	Inception Workshop Report
8	All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
9	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
10	Oversight mission reports
11	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
14	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
16	Audit reports
17	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles)
18	Sample of project communications materials
19	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
21	List of contracts and procurement items over ~US\$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information)
22	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GCF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or “catalytic” results)
23	Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available
24	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
25	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
26	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
27	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes

ToR Annex 2: Content of the TE report

i. Title page

- Title of UNDP-supported GCF-financed project
 - UNDP PIMS ID and GCF ID
 - TE timeframe and date of final TE report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GCF Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
 - TE Team members
- ii. Acknowledgements
- iii. Table of Contents
- iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
- Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Ratings Table
 - Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
 - Recommendations summary table

2. Introduction (2-3 pages)

- Purpose and objective of the TE
- Scope
- Methodology
- Data Collection & Analysis
- Ethics
- Limitations to the evaluation
- Structure of the TE report

3. Project Description (3-5 pages)

- Project start and duration, including milestones
- Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
- Problems that the project sought to address threats and barriers targeted
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Expected results
- Main stakeholders: summary list
- Theory of Change

4. Findings

(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be given a rating²)

4.1 Project Design/Formulation

- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

4.1 Project Implementation

² See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
 - Project Finance and Co-finance
 - Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
 - UNDP implementation/oversight (*) and Implementing Partner execution (*), overall project implementation/execution (*), coordination, and operational issues
- 4.2 Project Results
- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (*)
 - Relevance (*)
 - Effectiveness (*)
 - Efficiency (*)
 - Overall Outcome (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Gender
 - Other Cross-cutting Issues
 - Social and Environmental Standards
 - Sustainability: financial (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
 - Country Ownership
 - Gender equality and women's empowerment
 - Cross-cutting Issues
 - GCF Additionality
 - Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
 - Progress to Impact
5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Main Findings
 - Conclusions
 - Recommendations
 - Lessons Learned
6. Annexes
- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - TE Mission itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Summary of field visits
 - Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results
 - Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
 - TE Rating scales
 - Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
 - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form

- Signed TE Report Clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail
- *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GCF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

ToR Annex 3: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GCF Focal area, and to the environment and development priorities a the local, regional and national level?			
<i>(include evaluative questions)</i>	<i>(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</i>
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Gender equality and women’s empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women’s empowerment?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<i>To what extent have the project been impacted by COVID</i>			

ToR Annex 4: Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and: respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form³

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: _____

³ www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____ **I**
confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of
Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at ___ on _____

Signature: _____

ToR Annex 5: TE Rating Scales

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance	Sustainability ratings:
<p>6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings</p> <p>5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings</p> <p>4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings</p> <p>3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings</p> <p>2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings</p> <p>1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment</p>	<p>4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability</p> <p>2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability</p> <p>1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability</p>

ToR Annex 6: TE Report Clearance Form

Terminal Evaluation Report for (Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID) Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Name: A Z M Saleh

Signature:



Date: 03.03.2022

Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

Name: Burcu Dagurkuden

Signature:



Date: 09.03.2022

ToR Annex 7: TE Audit Trail

The following is a template for the TE Team to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This Audit Trail should be listed as an annex in the final TE report but not attached to the report file.

To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of (project name) (UNDP Project PIMS #)

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator's name) and track change comment number (“#” column):

Institution/ Organization	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken